

REMARKS

Applicants file concurrently herewith a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in response to the Final Office Action mailed September 25, 2007 (hereinafter, "Office Action"). In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18 and 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,896,618 to Benoy et al. (hereinafter, "Benoy"); rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Benoy*; rejected claims 11, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Benoy* in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,339,798 to Hedges et al. (hereinafter, "Hedges")¹; and rejected claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Benoy* in view of *Hedges* and U.S. Patent No. 6,116,402 to Beach et al. (hereinafter, "Beach").

By this response, Applicants hereby cancel claims 11, 12, 16, 17, 19, 21, and 22 without prejudice or disclaimer of their subject matter. In addition, Applicants amend claims 18 and 20, and add new claims 23-26. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 18, 20, and 23-26 are pending.

In light of the foregoing amendments and based on the reasoning presented below, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a), and request allowance of pending claims 18, 20, and 23-26.

¹ The Office Action includes claim 19 in the statement of rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over *Benoy* and, on the same page, rejects claim 19 under § 103(a) as being obvious over *Benoy* and *Hedges*. See Office Action, pp. 5-7. Because the Office Action provides no details of the rejection of claim 19 under § 103(a) over *Benoy* and *Hedges*, Applicants believe the second statement of rejection with respect to claim 19 is a typographical error, and claim 19 is only rejected over the *Benoy* reference.

I. Priority Under 35 U.S.C. § 119

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner provide an acknowledgment of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 at item 12 on the Office Action Summary, and an acknowledgement of receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents at item 12(a) on the Office Action Summary.

II. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

With respect to claims 21-22, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of *Benoy* has been rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Benoy*. A proper anticipation rejection requires that “each and every element set forth in the claim be found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *M.P.E.P.* § 2131. Applicants respectfully submit that *Benoy* fails to disclose all of the subject matter recited in independent claim 18.

Specifically, *Benoy* fails to disclose “displaying [a] message on the arcade game machine when a progress of the game reaches a certain game stage or status,” as recited in amended independent claim 18.

Instead, *Benoy* teaches a loyalty program registration method wherein the player enters personal identification information and loyalty program instrument information to a loyalty program registration interface. See *Benoy*, col. 15, ll. 52-56; col. 16, ll. 46-49. “Typically, when a game player wants to play a game on a gaming machine and utilize the player tracking services available through the player tracking unit, a game player inserts a player tracking card, such as a magnetic striped card, into the card reader 24.”

Id. at col. 10, ll. 38-42. According to *Benoy*, “[a]fter a player has inserted her or his player tracking card into the card reader 24, the player tracking unit 56 may command the touch screen display 16 to display the game player’s name on the touch screen display 16 and also, may optionally display a message requesting the game player to validate their identity by entering an identification code using a game service interface with an alpha-numeric key pad displayed on touch screen display 16.” *Id.* at col. 10, ll. 60-68.

While the Office Action alleges that requesting the game player to validate their identity corresponds to Applicants’ claim recitations, the Office Action is incorrect. Specifically, in *Benoy*, the optional display of the message is conditioned upon insertion of a player tracking card into a card reader, and the message is for the defined purpose of identity verification prior to play. In contrast, Applicants’ independent claim 18 recites, “displaying [a] message on the arcade game machine when a progress of the game reaches a certain game stage or status.”

For at least the above-outlined reasons, *Benoy* fails to disclose all of the subject matter recited in Applicants’ amended independent claim 18. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and allowance of independent claim 18, as well as amended claim 20 and new claim 23, which depend from independent claim 18.

Independent claims 24 and 26, although of different scope, include recitations similar to those of independent claim 18. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 18, Applicants submit that the cited art does not teach all the elements of Applicants’ new independent claims 24 and 26.

Therefore, independent claims 24 and 26, as well as dependent claim 25, are allowable over the cited art.

III. Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With respect to claims 11, 12, 16, 17, and 19, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of *Benoy, Hedges, and Beach* have been rendered moot by the cancellation of those claims.

IV. Conclusion

The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statements are identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

By: 

Richard V. Burgulian
Reg. No. 31,744

Dated: October 31, 2007